



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/594,223 | 09/25/2006 | Chio Ishihara | 129551 | 3348 |
| 25944 7590 04/03/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| SHEEHAN, JOHN P | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1793 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 04/03/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/594,223

Applicant(s)

ISHIHARA ET AL.

Examiner

John P. Sheehan

Art Unit

1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/88)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/25/06: 10/9/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Interpretation

2. The claims recite the phrase, "the Fe alloy powder consisting of" (claim 2, lines 3 and 4 and claim 3, line 4, emphasis added by the Examiner). The transitional phrase, "consisting of" excludes from "the Fe alloy powder" composition any additional elements not specified in the claims except for impurities.

The transitional phrase "consisting of" excludes any element, step, or ingredient not specified in the claim. *In re Gray*, 53 F.2d 520, 11 USPQ 255 (CCPA 1931); *Ex parte Davis*, 80 USPQ 448, 450 (Bd. App. 1948) ("consisting of" defined as "closing the claim to the inclusion of materials other than those recited except for impurities ordinarily associated therewith.").

See MPEP 2111.03.

In view of this, the Examiner has interpreted the phrase, "the Fe alloy powder consisting of", as use in claims 2 to 8, to limit the Fe alloy powder composition to 3 to 7 wt% Cr, 1.5 to 3.5 wt% Si and the balance Fe and impurities.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 3 to 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

I. Claim 3 recites, "mixing 0.1 to 3.5 mass% of the Si powder and the Fe alloy powder". The meaning of the phrase, "mixing 0.1 to 3.5 mass% of the Si powder" is not clear in that it is not clear what the basis is for the mass %. That is what is this percent based on?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Document No. 55-113803 (Japan '803, cited in the IDS submitted September 25, 2006) in view of the admitted known prior art on page 8, paragraph [0020] of the specification..

Japan '803 teaches a process comprising, preparing a Fe alloy powder containing 3 to 12 wt% Cr, 1 to 3 wt% Si and the balance Fe and unavoidable

Art Unit: 1793

impurities, compacting the Fe alloy powder into a compact and sintering the compact (Abstract). Japan '803's Fe alloy powder composition overlaps the Fe alloy powder composition recited in applicants' claim 1.

In the specification applicants acknowledge that the powder particle size of 75 to 150 μm recited in the claims "is an ordinary particle size for powder metallurgy" (applicants' specification, page 8, paragraph [0020], lines 1 and 2).

Claim 1 and Japan '803 differ in that although Japan '803 does not teach the exact same Fe alloy composition as recited in the instant claims, Japan '803 does teach a Fe alloy composition that overlaps the Fe alloy composition recited in claim 1. Further, Japan '803 is silent as to the average particle size of the Fe alloy powder.

However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have considered the invention to have been obvious because the Fe alloy proportions taught by Japan '803 overlap the instantly claimed proportions and therefore are considered to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of the disclosed ranges including the instantly claimed ranges from the ranges disclosed in the prior art reference, particularly in view of the fact that;

"The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages", In re Peterson 65 USPQ2d 1379 (CAFC 2003).

Also, In re Geisler 43 USPQ2d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (CCPA 1976); In re Malagari, 182 USPQ 549, 553 (CCPA 1974) and MPEP 2144.05.

Regarding the average Fe alloy powder particle size, it is the Examiner's position that, as disclosed by applicants', the average powder particle size recited in the claims is conventional (applicants' specification, page 8, paragraph [0020], lines 1 and 2).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 2 to 7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding claim 8, none of the references alone or in combination teach or suggest a method as recited in claim 1 wherein the Fe alloy powder is annealed at a temperature of 600 to 800⁰C.

9. Regarding claims 3 to 7, none of the references alone or in combination teach or suggest a method comprising, preparing a Si powder having an average particle size of 1 to 45 μm and an Fe alloy powder having an average particle size of 75 to 150 μm , the Fe alloy powder consisting of 3 to 7 mass% of Cr, 1.5 to 3.5 mass% of Si, and balance of Fe and inevitable impurities; mixing 0.1 to 3.5 mass% of the Si powder and the Fe alloy powder to obtain a mixed powder; compacting the mixed powder into a green compact having a predetermined shape; and sintering the green compact.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Sheehan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1249. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (7:30-5:00) Second Monday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John P. Sheehan/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1793

Jps